REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant cancels claims 21-31, and adds new claims 32-50. Support for new claim 32 can be found in Applicant's specification on page 6, par. 53, and page 7, par. 70 of the published application. Support for the new claims can be found in Applicant's specification on page 2, paragraphs 13-17 and 20-21, as well as page 6, paragraph 57 - page 7, paragraph 70.

35 USC §103 (Thompson and Williams)

The Office rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9-17, and 19-20 as being obvious over Thompson et al. (US 5441070) in view of Williams et al. (US 5956248). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, especially in light of the arguments below.

Applicant canceled 1-20, and thereby rendered the above rejections moot.

Regarding new claims 32-51, Thompson fails to teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of claim 32, and specifically, (a) a flow sensor that monitors the fluid flow, (b) an interface module that shuts the valve when the fluid flow exceeds a predetermined threshold, and (c) power panel that includes a processor and the interface module. Although Thompson describes the use of fluid flow sensors, the Thompson device uses such sensors to signal a shut-off valve to open when fluid flow exceeds a predetermined threshold (Abstract; Fig. 1; C5/L62-68; C6/L40-68). In contrast, claim 32 requires that the fluid flow be monitored, and the valve shut when the fluid flow exceeds a predetermined threshold.

The combination of Thompson and Williams similarly fails to teach, suggest, or motivate these limitations. Williams discusses an irrigation controller having a microprocessor that stores and executes a watering program (Abstract; Fig. 8; C2/L47-53). Williams fails to teach, suggest, or motivate a system configured to monitor fluid flow and shut a valve when the fluid flow exceeds a predetermined threshold. Rather, the Williams controller controls fluid flow based upon the day of the week, the time of day, and the elapsed run time of the sprinklers (C2/L31-46). Although the irrigation controller in Williams includes a panel, such panel fails to connect to and monitor a plurality of sensors. At best, the Williams device monitors a single rain sensor to determine whether or not to run the watering program as scheduled (C4/L25-30).

35 USC §103 (Thompson, Williams, and Papadopoulos)

The Office rejected claims 12 and 18 as being obvious over Thompson et al. (US 5441070) in view of Williams et al. (US 5956248) further in view of Papadopoulos et al. (US 6061603). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, especially in light of the arguments below.

Applicant canceled 12 and 18, and thereby rendered the rejection moot.

Regarding new claims 32-51, Thompson and Williams fails to teach, suggest, or motivate all of the claimed limitations, as discussed above. The addition of Papadopoulos fails to remedy these defects.

Request For Allowance

Claims 32-51 are pending in this application. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,
Fish & Associates, PC

Date: May 22, 2009

By: /Robert D. Fish/
Robert D. Fish
Reg. No. 33880

Fish & Associates, PC
2603 Main Street, Suite 1000
Irvine, CA 92614-4271
Telephone (949) 943-8300
Fax (949) 943-8358